

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his point of order?

Mr. GREGG. I yield solely for the purpose of a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I was here for most of your remarks. First I want to commend you. In my recollection of the discussions we had with those who were in the administration prior to this involvement, with reference to Russia, there was almost kind of a trite answer—don't worry, they will not do anything.

I want to ask you if there is not a serious problem coming about now. They are going to have elections next year. We have always wondered how long will it be before their nationalist temperaments come back to the surface and they move in the wrong direction politically. I wonder if you might speculate or reason with me about that.

My evaluation, based upon a number of people who have talked about Russia and an analysis that has been given to me, is that they are now so anti-American and so antiwest that they are apt to move in a rather concerted manner by large numbers of votes in a direction that is not moving toward a marketplace economy and democracy. Is that your concern also?

Mr. GREGG. I think the Senator from New Mexico, as usual, has hit the nail on the head. That is the most significant strategic concern we have on the issue of Kosovo, which is where does Russia end up? Do we end up forcing it down the road towards a nationalist state with maybe irresponsible leadership? Or do we continue it on the path of democracy and marketplace economy?

I think that ever since the end of the cold war period everyone has analyzed the Russian situation as being tentative. The biggest concern of everyone who has analyzed it is that they may go the course of a nationalist leader who might use the West as the purpose for uniting a militaristic response, a militaristic nation approach. That is the concern. The Senator's point is absolutely on target.

Our biggest strategic interest today is what happens with Russia.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN KOSOVO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I commend my colleagues for the time they

have taken on the floor to talk about the situation in Kosovo. I was privileged this last weekend to be selected to be part of the first leadership delegation to go to the Balkans. It was a joint House and Senate delegation involving Democrats and Republicans, and it was a whirlwind trip. We all came back exhausted, but I think each of us came back better informed about the situation.

I would like to speak to that a few moments, following up on the speech just given by my colleague.

Let me say at the outset that I am a product of the Vietnam era. I did not serve in the military nor in Vietnam, obviously, but I came to the conclusion, as a result of that experience, that war is the last resort; that there is no such thing as a military adventure. When military is involved, people die. It should be taken ever so seriously.

That has guided me through 17 years of service on Capitol Hill. I have not been quick to turn to the military or quick to pull the trigger. I have always looked for an alternative, a peaceful alternative. Yet, I believe we find ourselves in the Balkans in a situation where, frankly, there was no alternative but the use of force.

The Senator raised the question about what in the world is our national interest in Kosovo? Most Americans could not find it on a map. Why are we sending all this money and all of our troops, all of the resources of this country focused on Serbia? Why?

It is part of Europe. It is part of a continent where the United States has a special interest. And if there is any doubt about that special interest, merely tour the veterans cemeteries in Europe, because in World War I and World War II, our best and brightest in America put on their uniforms, picked up their guns and went to Europe to defend the stability and future of that continent.

We have an Atlantic alliance, not just because of a common ethnic heritage, but because we believe the synergy between the United States and Europe brings strength to the Atlantic, brings strength to both countries, both regions, and we have committed ourselves to that.

Today, as you look at the map of Europe, the investments we made in two World Wars and the cold war has paid off so well. We now have former Warsaw Pact nations, like Poland, like the Czech Republic and like Hungary, waiting in line and finally being accepted as part of the NATO alliance. They are part of our alliance. We won. We are bringing Europe together. Our leadership makes a difference.

But, yes, in one corner of Europe, a terrible thing has occurred over the last 12 years. A man by the name of Slobodan Milosevic has on four separate occasions started a war in this region of Europe. If you look at the nature of the war, you will find some harrowing language from this man.

Twelve years ago in Kosovo, he stood up to the Serbs and said, "They will

not beat you again," and heard this roar of approval. This man, who was a minor league Communist apparatchik, said, "I have a rallying cry here. I can rally the Serbs in their hatred of other ethnic groups." If you think I am overstating the case, in 1989, he went to Kosovo, stood on a battlefield where a war had been fought in 1389 and the Serbs had lost to the Ottoman Turks, and announced his policy of ethnic cleansing. As a result of his policy, that region has been at war and in turmoil ever since.

For those who act surprised at Slobodan Milosevic, merely look at the history. For those who question why we are there, look at the history of the 20th century. We have said that Europe is important to the United States, and we have said something else: America does not go to war for territory or for treasure. We go to war for values. And the values at stake in this conflict are values that Americans can take at heart.

Some have said that President Clinton came up with Kosovo at the last minute. Yet, history tells us that as President George Bush left office, knowing what Milosevic was all about, he left a letter behind to President Clinton saying: Watch Kosovo. We have warned Milosevic—do not show your aggression toward the province of Kosovo. President George Bush knew that. President Clinton was forewarned. And he has tried, with limited success, to contain this man's barbarism.

Of course, they raise the question over whether or not we should have started the bombing in the Serbian area and in Kosovo. I voted for it. I voted for it because there was no alternative, none whatsoever.

Many people have questioned the strategy ever since—important questions, questions that should be answered. But at least we have the answer to one question. When the United States saw this ethnic cleansing, this genocide in Serbia, did we stand idly by and do nothing? The answer is no, and that is an important answer.

We decided to use the resources at our disposal to try to stop Milosevic from what he was doing. Of course, he is equally adept and should be recognized as a man of military means. He decided since he could not invade the neighboring nations of Albania and Macedonia with troops, he would overwhelm them with refugees.

Saturday, I spent the afternoon in a refugee camp in Macedonia, near Skopje, named Brazda. You read about it a lot. It is a camp that did not exist 2 weeks ago, and 32,000 people live there today in that camp. The day I came and the previous 2 days, 7,500 people had flooded into this camp from Kosovo. These are not the poorest of the poor dragging themselves in. These are teachers and businessmen. These are doctors and lawyers whose neighbors put on black ski masks and came to the door and said, "Take everything

that you want in your arms and leave in 5 minutes; we're blowing up your house." You have heard it on television, but I heard it firsthand.

Standing in that camp and talking to those people, I asked a simple open-ended question: Why did you leave Kosovo? The stories came back the same time and time again. They did not leave for a crime or wrongdoing; they left because of who they were, and that is the nature of genocide and "geno-suffering."

Now, of course, they are trying to survive, and we are helping them. Thank God we are. NATO is building camps. The humanitarian relief from around the world is inspiring, and yet these people wait, wondering what their fate will be.

I came away from that experience understanding better the Holocaust, understanding what must have been in the minds of so many Jewish people at the end of World War II who said: We need Israel because we have nowhere to go. Everywhere we go, we have been persecuted, we have been killed. Now the Kosovar refugees ask the same question: Where shall we go?

Our policy is to allow them to return to Kosovo. That is where they want to be. That is where they should be. We have said to Mr. Milosevic: Here is what we are asking of you, demanding of you: Remove your troops from Kosovo, allow the refugees to return in safety with an international force to protect them, and then we will negotiate the political status.

I think that is sensible and humane. May I say a word, too, about Russia. Yes, I am concerned about the reaction of Russia. It is important that Russia prosper and get stronger. We have helped in many ways and can do more, and I am sure we will. But Russia is a master of its own destiny, too. If it decides it is better to be an ally of Slobodan Milosevic than an ally of the United States, then, of course, it is a decision they can freely make and one with which they will have to live.

I hope they do not make that decision. I hope instead of arming Milosevic so he can shoot down American and NATO planes that they will decide they can play a more positive and constructive role; that Russia could be part of the brokerage of peace, lasting peace in the region; that Russia could provide some troops in an international peacekeeping force in Kosovo so that it will be more acceptable to the Serbian side. They can do that, and I hope that they will. But I think it is faulty logic to argue that we should restrain our foreign policy for fear that the Russians might react against it. Did we stop to ask the Russians whether we should bomb Saddam Hussein? I certainly hope not. We knew what our national interest was, and we proceeded with it.

We hope the Russians will be with us, but they certainly should not have a veto over our foreign policy.

Allow me, if you will, to speak for a moment about the state of our mili-

tary. General Wes Clark, who is our commander in chief now of the NATO operations in Kosovo, is an extraordinary man. He was first in his class at West Point, a Rhodes scholar. He is articulate, dedicated, and patriotic. Thank God for him and people just like him who have dedicated their lives and service to our country.

He met with us at great length and answered literally every question we had to ask about this operation. Is he frustrated? Of course, he is. This is NATO's first war. America has fought wars before, but this is a war by committee with 19 nations gathering together to talk of strategy, and that is a frustration to any commander in chief. He understands our mission, and he is executing it professionally.

It troubles me to hear some of my friends on the other side of the aisle suggest that after 25 days of bombing in Serbia and Kosovo somehow or another the American military might has been decimated.

I sure did not see that, not at Aviano Air Base or Ramstein in Germany. I saw a strong military that needs our support. I do not believe it is in the weak condition that many of my colleagues are suggesting.

The President said we need \$6 billion to make sure it continues to be strong. I hope we move on that quickly and we do not use this request by the administration as an excuse to get into a prolonged political debate about whether or not the military has been treated well over the last few years. Let us focus on the immediate needs: Supplying our troops and making certain they can defend themselves and successfully prosecute this mission.

Let me also say that the Senator concluded with three recommendations about refugees. I disagree with his conclusion that we move them to another place. They want to return to Kosovo. They should return to Kosovo. I agree with him in bringing Russia in for peace negotiations. And I certainly agree with his conclusion that we should not involve ground troops in this effort.

I say to those who are witnessing this event, the American people are now focusing more on it, as they should. My visit over the last 3 days, this last weekend, focused my attention on it as well. I am proud of what the United States is doing. I am proud of what NATO is doing and what it stands for. I believe we are standing for values that we have stood for for at least the 20th century, if not longer.

I believe we can succeed. But we cannot succeed when a television program like "Nightline," 7 days into the war, has a program entitled "The Kosovo Crisis: Still no end in sight." Seven days—7 days into the war they want it over with, and all the political pundits are coming on television on Sunday and saying, well, we must have lost that war. It is a good thing they were not around during the Battle of the Bulge. Who knows how that war might

have ended? It is going to take patience and determination to bring this to a good conclusion. I hope Members of both political parties will join together to make that happen.

I will tell you, when there was a vote on the Persian Gulf war, President Bush came to Congress and asked for our approval. I voted against it. I did not think it was necessary. I thought we could achieve our goals without the use of the military. But I lost and the vote went against me; the military action was approved. Immediately after that vote, a resolution was introduced, and passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis, that said the debate is behind us now, we are behind our men and women in uniform, and we will stay behind them to the end.

There will be plenty of time to debate this. History will be the judge of whether we did the right thing and did it in the right way. For the time being, let us, as a nation, let those of us, as elected officials in the Senate and the House, have the determination to stand behind this policy.

What are our options? Well, there are three. We can stand behind this policy of bombing, or we can leave, or we can send in ground troops. It is an easy choice for me. I am going to stand behind this policy, because the future of NATO is at stake, the future of Europe is at stake, and the values of the United States, that we have defended so long, are at stake as well.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUIDANCE FOR THE DESIGNATION OF EMERGENCIES AS A PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 557, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 557) to provide guidance for the designation of emergencies as part of the budget process.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 254

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator ABRAHAM, Senator DOMENICI, and others, I send an amendment to the pending budget bill to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.